

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended Claims 1-2, 5, 12-13, 15-19, 27-28 and 30-32. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, Claims 1-2, 5-7, 9-22, 24-28 and 30-38 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 5-7, and 9-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Claims 1-2, 7, 12-13 and 15-19 have been amended to direct them to statutory subject matter.

The Examiner rejected claims 27-28, and 30-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Claims 27-28 and 30-32 have been amended to direct them to statutory subject matter.

3. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1,2,5-7,9-17,19-22,24-28,30-34 and 36-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Purcell et al (US 5,598,514) in view of Nishino et al. (US 5,237,424). The Examiner rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Purcell et al (US 5,598,514) in view of Nishino et al. (US 5,237,424). In the previous response, Applicant provided detailed arguments as to why the cited references are not suggestive of the present invention. In response, the Examiner stated:

Applicant's arguments filed 4/8/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., uncompressed YUV) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181,26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant would state as follows: claims 1, 21, 27 and 33 each refer to "YCbCr 4:2:0 format." In the industry, YCbCr is known to be an inherently raw and uncompressed format. Figure 8 illustrate what is meant by (uncompressed) YCbCr 4:2:0 as it is typically organized. Figure 9, shows the new inventive way of organizing/interleaving the (uncompressed) YCbCr 4:2:0 as described in the claims.

Purcell does not describe an "interleaved YCbCr 4:2:0", but rather 4:2:2, which is conventionally known. In YCbCr 4:2:0, there are twice as many luminance samples as total number of chrominance samples in the two chrominance components. In a 4:2:2 format, the number of luminance samples is equal to the sum of the number of samples in the two chrominance components. In Figure 6B of Purcell there are 16 luminance samples (Y) and 8 + 8 chrominance samples (U and V) which means that the sub sampling format is 4:2:2. Hence, Purcell does not disclose an interleaved YCbCr 4:2:0.

The concept of storing YUV 4:2:0 in an interleaved format is central to the present invention and Purcell fails to disclose or suggest storing YUV 4:2:0 in an interleaved format. The standard way of storing YUV 4:2:2 is in an interleaved format so it is not surprising that Purcell in his examples in the drawings shows the pixels in 4:2:2 format interleaved. This does not mean that a skilled video engineer automatically would store YUV 4:2:0 video interleaved after reading the Purcell patent. The obvious and most practical way of implementing Purcell's invention for YUV 4:2:0 would be to keep the luminance and the chrominance blocks separate and not interleaved.

Nishino fails to overcome the deficiencies of Purcell as it teaches a method for interleaved storage on tape of compressed YUV 4:2:2 video, not uncompressed YUV 4:2:0; and Nishino does not disclose or suggest full scan line interleaving.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Registration No. 50,298

Date: October 30, 2009

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-4145
michael.cameron@ericsson.com